

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter of Claims 30-39. Applicant would like to call to the Examiner's attention Applicant's Preliminary Amendment dated February 5, 2004, which was submitted simultaneously with the instant application, and in which Applicant requested Claims 1-29 be canceled. (A copy is attached hereto.) Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Preliminary Amendment, and forward a Notice of Allowability.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the Examiner's objection to the drawings. Specifically, with reference to Figure 13, Applicant notes that the reference to Figures 13A-C though not specifically located in the specification, are clearly understood in the specification as it currently stands. In particular, Applicant notes that the subject matter of Figure 13 is directed to the second embodiment described in the specification, and the description of this portion begins on page 33.

This portion of the specification describes the advantageous results that can be achieved through the performance of write-erase, erase-write-erase and write-erase write-erase operations. The detailed description concerning this aspect of operation is described in pages 33-38 and lines 1-2 on page 38 note that Figure 13 summarizes the modes of the operations according to the present invention. It is clear that the reference to Figure 13 at that point in the specification is merely a summary of write-erase, erase-write-erase and write-erase write-erase operations described in the preceding pages. Applicant submits that no further


clarification is required. In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this portion of the specification more than adequately describes the referenced portions of the drawings and accordingly, Applicant submits that no drawing correction is necessary.

In regard to the drawing objections set forth by the Examiner in paragraph 2, Applicant notes that Figure 4 and the corresponding written description on page 22 describes the semiconductor material specified in the claims. Accordingly, corrected drawing sheets are not required. Similarly, the reference portion of the specification provides appropriate support and clarity for the referenced semiconductor material, and therefore Applicant submits that the Examiners rejection of Claim 30 under §112 is improper. Applicant has previously canceled Claims 1-29, and therefore the rejection of Claims 1-3, 12, 15-16 is improper. Similarly, the obviousness rejection of the previously canceled claims, as well as the rejections under §102, are now rendered moot.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow all claims in the application.

Date: 10/12/04

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Depke  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC**  
131 S. Dearborn, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 263-3600  
Attorney for Applicant

(Reg. #37,607)

Appl. No. 10/772,638  
Amdt. Dated October 12, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2004



**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States  
Postal Service as First Class Mail on 10/12/04 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. M. D. B." followed by a long, sweeping flourish. Below the signature, the text "Attorney for Applicants" is printed in a smaller, sans-serif font.